

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/661,576	SHIRAISHI, SHUNTA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gay Ann Spahn	3673	

All Participants:
Status of Application: _____

 (1) Gay Ann Spahn, Patent Examiner.

(3) _____.

 (2) Harvey B. Jacobson, Jr, Attorney.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 June 2005
Time: _____

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

11-30

Prior art documents discussed:

None
Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called Attorney Jacobson to note that method claims 11-24 were in condition for allowance, but that newly added system claims 25-30 were being restricted out by original presentation. The examiner inquired as to whether Attorney Jacobson were willing to cancel claims 25-30 in order for case to be allowed. However, Attorney Jacobson said that he would have to contact his client first. The examiner noted that this case had to have an action done and therefore told Attorney Jacobson that she would send out a Quayle Action.